DAŚARŪPAKA-PADDHATI

BY

Kuravi RĀMA

TOGETHER WITH

APPENDIX I

A DIFFICULT ILLUSTRATIVE VERSE IN THE

DAŚARŪPĀVALOKA

AND

APPENDIX II

ORRECTED TEXT OF THE PORTION OF THE *AVALOKA*

on verse IV-34 of the *Daśārūpaka*

with

Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's Commentary, the *Laghuṭīkā*

Edited with Introduction and Notes

By

T. VENKATACHARYA

Associate Professor of Sanskrit,

University of Toronto

1968

Printed in India at the G. S. Press, Madras-2
Published by V. Sambamurty, 467, Poonamalli High Road, Madras-10

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	.. 5-15
Daśarūpaka-Paddhati (Sanskrit Text)	.. 19–42
Index of items in the *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati*	.. 43–46
Appendix I:	
A difficult illustrative verse in the *Daśārūpāvaloka*	.. 47–60
Appendix II:	
Corrected text of the portion of the *Avaloka* with Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's commentary	.. 61–69

Kuravi Rāma's *DAŚARŪPAKA-PADDHATI*

*INTRODUCTION

In the beginning of Kuravi Rāma's unpublished commentary on the *Viśvaguṇādarśacampū* the following two verses occur:

yaccetaś candracūḍe tataparikalanād
bhṛṅgakīṭāyamānaṃ,
yenākāry appayādhvaryuditakuvalayānandaṭip-
paṇy amoghā ¦
yaś campūbhāratīyām atanuta vivṛtiṃ
svādyagūḍhārthasārāṃ,
vyutpitsor dāśarūpīty avahad iha mudaṃ paddhatir
vā yadīyā ¦|
bhrātuḥ sāhityakalāṃ sāṅgopāṅgām adhītya
gopālāt ¦
viśvaguṇādarśaṃ sa vyākhyāti śrīkuravirāmaḥ ||
(Hultzsch, Report, I, extract 21, p. 57)

The first line in the *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* running as

anavadhikaruṇāvāridhim ānamyātmani sadāśivaṃ
devaṃ

shows that Kuravi Rāma was a devotee of Śiva, and the first line of the first verse quoted above refers to his deep and extensive meditation on his personal Deity, and thereby he seems to imply his consequent feeling of the Almighty's presence always, as

*A major part of this Introduction was read at the 27th International Congress of Orientalists in Ann Arbor, Michigan, on Wednesday, the 16th of August, 1967, in Section 3: South Asia in Ancient and Classical Times.

he mentions in this context that his mind was like an example of the *bhramarakīṭanyāya.*[1] In the

1. The maxim of *bhramarakīṭa* refers to the case of an insect which, having once been stung by a highly poisonous wasp, remains always thinking of the wasp through deadly fear of being stung again, and as a result sees the wasp in everything, and finally gets metamorphosed into the form of the latter. The case is generally cited to emphacize the belief in the efficacy of meditation. The two following verses of Śaṅkarācārya from his *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* explain the significance of the *bhramarakīṭa-nyāya* :

sati sakto naro yāti sadbhāvaṃ hy ekaniṣṭhayā |
kīṭako bhramaraṃ dhyāyan bhramaratvāya kalpate (359)
kriyāntarāsaktim apāsya kīṭako
dhyāyan yathāliṃ hy alibhāvam ṛcchati |
tathaiv yogī paramātmatattvaṃ
dhyātvā samāyāti tadekaniṣṭhayā || (360)

I understand that the *bhramara* or *bhṛṅga* or *ali* of the *bhramarakīṭa-nyāya* is not the generally known type of bee, but the words in this context refer to a poisonous wasp which is also one of the allied species. Many opinions and theories of the past do not seem to be acceptable to the modern scientists. It is therefore no wonder, and it is a different thing, if the modern biologists should regard as fanciful the explanation of the so-called *bhramarakīṭa-nyāya* mentioned by Śaṅkarācārya and others.

Though the verses of Śaṅkarācārya refer to the change of form finally into that of *the object* of meditation, Kuravi Rāma's statement may perhaps be taken to refer to his deep and extensive meditation on his personal Deity, and his consequent feeling of the Almighty's presence everywhere. A somewhat similar description of Kaṃsa's seeing Kṛṣṇa everywhere is found in the following verse of the *Bhāgavata*:

āsīnaḥ saṃviśaṃs tiṣṭhan bhuñjānaḥ paryaṭan mahīm |
cintayāno hṛṣīkeśam apaśyat tanmayaṃ jagat || *Bhāga.*, X, 2-28.

It is not clear whether Kuravi Rāma's statement of *bhṛṅgakīṭāyamānatva* has reference to any situation in his personal life, or the simile is intended only to refer to the aspect of his constant meditation. I am indebted to Śrī P. N. P. Śāstriar for the information on the two verses of Śaṅkarācārya quoted above. I also learn from my friend Mr. G. Rāmasubba Śarmā that Allasāni Peddana, a Telugu poet of the 16th century, makes use of the *bhramarakīṭa-nyāya* in his well-known work *Manucaritramu* (2-33).

second and third lines of the same verse he speaks of his commentary on the *Kuvalayānanda* of Appayya-*dīkṣita* and on the *Campūbhārata*.[2] In the fourth line he mentions his *Dāśarūpī Paddhati* (the present work). In the second verse he says that he learnt the *sāhitya-kalā* from his brother Gopāla.

As he wrote a commentary on the *Viśvaguṇādarśa* of Veṅkaṭādhvarin (of *circa* 1637 A.D.) and as in his commentary the *Makarandajharī* on the *Kuvalayānanda* he criticizes vehemently the views and interpretations of Vaidyanātha Tatsat (1683 A.D.), the author of the *Candrikā,* another commentary on the *Kuvalayānanda,* Kuravi Rāma could not have been earlier than the last part of the 17th century. E. Hultzsch says in his Report, I, that our author is said to have lived at the court of one of the Zamindars of Kārveṭinagaram (then) in the North Arcot District. Kuravi Rāma is also reported to have translated the *Vāsavadattā* (of Subandhu?) into Telugu under the title of *Vāsavadattā-pariṇayam.* In his *Makarandajharī* Kuravi Rāma says as follows:

kāvyaprakāśamukhalakṣaṇapāradṛśvā
kalyāṇanavyabahukāvyavidhānacuñcuḥ |
sāhityasāranidhir appayadīkṣitīya-
vyākhyām imāṃ kuravirāmakavir vidhatte ||

2. His commentary on the *Campūbhārata* known as *lāsya* was published many times by the Nirṇayasāgara Press, Bombay, of which I was able to get the fifth edition (1950). The title page of this edition, perhaps it was so in other editions too, is misleading as it mentions the commentator as Rāmacandra-Budhendra instead of Kuravi Rāma, or Kuravi Rāmakavi. The commentator on the *Campūrāmāyaṇa* is known as Rāmacandra-Budhendra. The author of the *lāsya* on the *Campūbhārata* is different from Rāmacandra-Budhendra, and must be mentioned as Kuravi Rāma.

He thus appears to have been a modern but prolific writer of South India, and a man of great erudition.[3]

Kuravi Rāma's *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* is not a commentary on the *Daśarūpaka*, as was mentioned by some scholars, but is an independent work on dramaturgy. As the author says in the beginning of the work

vyutpitsumude kathayati daśarūpakavartma
kuravirāmakaviḥ ||

yady api pūrvaiḥ kathitañ caitad daśarūpakādiṣu
tathāpi |

vyutpitsūnām asmin sugamāya paraṃ
mamārambhaḥ ||

his intention in writing this handbook was to make the subject of dramaturgy attractive to those who were desirous of learning it without much trouble, although it had been dealt with by previous writers in works such as the *Daśarūpaka* (in which only after some patient efforts one could expect the pleasure of under-

3. One can see in the *lāsya* his references to and discussions on the topics of various branches of Sanskrit learning. For instance, see

(1)	N. S. P. Edn. 1950, page	297	..	(*Mimāṃsā*)
(2)	„	304	..	(*Nyāya*)
(3)	„	319	..	(*Jyotiṣa*)
(4)	„	347	..	(*Vedānta*)
(5)	„	353	..	(*Gṛhyasūtra*)
(6)	„	461	..	(*Chandas*)
(7)	„	73	..	(*Śākuna*)

In addition to these, he quotes a number of authoritative works for supporting his own views. His criticisms of the interpretations of one Nṛsiṃha, another commentator on the *Campūbhārata*, appear to be just and penetrating.

standing). This, therefore, is a brief treatise on dramaturgy consisting of verses, mostly *anuṣṭubh*, numbering just over a hundred. Kuravi Rāma says at the end as

> *daśottaraśataślokair daśarūpakapaddhatiḥ,*
> *darśitā sādhu kuravikulakṣīrāmbudhīndunā* |
> *rāmasaṅkhyāvatā; kṛtyā prīyatāṃ śaṅkaro'nayā* ||

which informs us that the work consisted of one hundred and ten verses. This seems to be a round number, as there are actually one hundred and ten and a half.

He obviously draws upon the *Daśarūpaka* for his *Paddhati*. In his plan to compress the essentials of all the ten kinds of dramatic composition, he naturally avoids many details. Many verses of the *Daśarūpaka* are incorporated by him, sometimes in full and sometimes with slight variations. For instance the line in the DP

> *garbhas tu dṛṣṭanaṣṭasya bījasyānveṣaṇaṃ muhuḥ*
> (67-b)

is the same as 1-36 (a) of the *Daśarūpaka*. Similarly the verses 56 and 57 of the DP are again reproduced from the DR. Prose passages from Dhanika's commentary on the DR are utilized by Kuravi Rāma while giving some of his own verses, and at the same time making clearer some of the compound-forms used in the *Avaloka*. For instance Dhanika says on 1-23

(1) *ekena prayojanenānvitānāṃ kathāṃśānām avāntaraikaprayojanasaṃbandhaḥ sandhiḥ* (N.S.P. ed. 1941, p. 6)

and the verse in the DP is

ekaprayojanopetakathāṃśānām avāntaraiḥ |
prayojanair yaḥ[4] *saṃbandhaḥ sandhir eṣa tu pañcadhā ||*

(2) *parisarpapraśamavajropanyāsapuṣpāṇāṃ prādhānyaṃ*

is the statement of Dhanika (on 1-35, p. 16), and here we have the verse as

parisarpapragamavajropanyāsāś ca puṣpakaṃ |
mukhyāny atra .... || (vv. 89-90)

(3) Similarly at the end of the *mukhasandhi* Dhanika says
eteṣām upakṣepaparikaraparinyāsayuktyudbheda-samādhānānām avaśyaṃbhāvitā (*ibid.* p. 11)

where Kuravi Rāma has

.... *atra cādimāḥ |*
trayo yuktyudbhedasamādhānāny āhuḥ pradhānataḥ || v. 82

(4) On 1-43 Dhanika says
avamarśanam avamarśaḥ paryālocanam. tacca krodhena vā, vyasanād vā, vilobhanena vā, 'bhavitavyaṃ anenārthena' ityekāntaphalaprāptyavasāyātmā garbhasandhyudbhinna bījārthasaṃbandho vimarśo'vamarśaḥ (*ibid.* p. 21)

and on this KR's verse is

garbhasandhau prasiddhasya bījārthasyāvamarśanam |
hetunā yena kenāpi vimarśaḥ sandhir iṣyate || v. 68.

4. Kuravi Rāma does not always observe the so-called general rule of having a short vowel in the fifth syllable of the *anuṣṭubh*.

He sometimes seems to hold a view different from that of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and the DR. For instance the *samavakāra* type of drama is defined in the N.S. and the DR as *khyātavṛtta* (i.e. having a theme well-known in the epics). But Kuravi Rāma says in this connection

vīrapradhānāś ca rasā utpādyam itivṛttakam (21-b)
so'sau samakavāraḥ syād vīthyaṅgaiḥ kaiścid anvitaḥ (24-a)

Vidyānātha in his *Pratāparudrīya* says about the plot of the *samavakāra as kalpitam itivṛttaṃ prasiddhaṃ vā* (Bālamanoramā Press, 1950, p. 74)

Kuravi Rāma does not mention the second alternative. No other writer seems to mention that the *itivṛtta* of the *samavakāra* can also be *utpādya* (i.e. invented). Similarly, Kuravi Rāma's simple statement

śṛṅgārādiprabhedena rasaḥ syād aṣṭadhā

perhaps implies his unwillingness to join others in the matter of accepting even the *śāntarasa*.

One or two items such as *paṭākṣepapraveśa, nāndī,* and *dhruvā,* which are not mentioned in the *Daśarūpaka,* are also included in the DP. (See verses 63, 64 (a), 27, 29(b) to 33). The verse 63 in the DP runs as

harṣaśokādisañjātasaṃbhramāditvarānvitam |
paṭākṣepāt praviśati pātram;........ ||

In this context Raṅganātha in his commentary on the *Vikramorvaśīya* says that *apaṭīkṣepa* (instead of *paṭīkṣepa*) is the correct expression. His remarks on this topic are worth quoting:

kutracit tataḥ praviśanti apaṭīkṣepeṇa iti pāṭhaḥ. sa nāṭakagranthādarśananibandhanaḥ. yataḥ 'nāsūcitasya pātrasya praveśo nāṭake mataḥ' iti nāṭakasamayaprasiddher yatra asūcitapātrapraveśas tatra ākasmikapraveśe apaṭīkṣepeṇa iti vacanam yuktam. atra tu prastāvanānte sūcitānām eva apsarasāṃ praveśa iti. kecit punaḥ na paṭīkṣepaḥ = apaṭīkṣepaḥ iti vigrahaṃ vidhāya paṭīkṣepaṃ vinaiva praviśanti iti samarthayante. tad api āpādyakucodyamātram[5] *ity āstāṃ tāvat. purūravasaḥ praveśe tu apaṭīkṣepo yuktaḥ. asūcitatvāt. apaṭī = javanikā, tasyāḥ kṣepeṇa = apasāraṇena. apaṭī kāṇḍapaṭaḥ syāt pratisīrā javanikā tiraskariṇī iti halāyudhaḥ.*

(Vikr. ed. by S. P. Pandit, 1901, BSS, XVI, Notes, p. 9)

Thus Raṅganātha prefers *apaṭīkṣepa* to *paṭīkṣepa*, but he does not say anything about the expression *paṭākṣepa*, which also seems to be a reading in some manuscripts. See the same edition, footnote readings on page 3. *Paṭa* in *paṭākṣepa* appears to be in the sense of *apaṭī* cited by Raṅganātha. Professor Monier Williams in his edition of the *Śakuntalā* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1876) gives the reading as *paṭākṣepeṇa*

5. I learn through a personal communication from my teacher Professor Satkari Mookerjee that in the works on Indian Logic the expression *āpādyakucodyamātra* is understood thus: *āpādya* is the undesirable consequence *codya* is objection; *kucodya* is a bad objection, conceived in a captious spirit. (So) What is alleged to follow as the consequent (*āpādya*) is but a frivolous issue—an objection which bespeaks a bad cavilling attitude.

(pp. 144 & 230), and notes that this was the reading in many manuscripts and also according to the commentator Kāṭayavema. There is a close resemblance between Kāṭayavema's explanation *paṭākṣepeṇa* = *yavanikāpanodanena* = *akasmāt; harṣaśokādijanita-saṃbhramayuktasya naṭasya praveśaḥ paṭākṣepeṇa kriyate,* and the verse 63 of the DP quoted above. The following verse of the N.S. (327,, Ch. 32, GOS)

> *adhruvās tu praveśāḥ syur gāyato rudatas tathā* |
> *saṃbhrame preṣaṇe caiva hy utpāte vismaye tathā* ||

and one of the interpretations shown by Abhinava in his commentary on this verse, seem to be the basis for the significance of *paṭākṣepapraveśa* (i.e. hurried entrance of a character on the stage with a toss of the curtain) noted by Raṅganātha, Kāṭayavema and Kuravi Rāma. The reading *apaṭākṣepakṛtā* (*apaṭīkṣepakṛtā?*) in the verse 413 in the same chapter of the N.S. (GOS) seems to be dubious. Even if it be proved to be genuine, the word *ākṣepa* of the reading may perhaps be taken as a synonym of *apakarṣaṇa* mentioned in the verse 12-3 (*ibid.*) *paṭe caivāpakarṣite,* and the expression *apaṭākṣepakṛtā* may then mean "not by the (usual) drawing aside of the curtain" (but with a toss of the curtain, to indicate the hurried entrance). This may avoid any inconsistency between the two statements of the *Nāṭyaśāstra.* Raṅganātha's implied preference of the expression *apaṭīkṣepa* over *paṭīkṣepa* is perhaps due to Amara's recording as *paṭo'strī syāt* according to which the feminine form *paṭī* is incorrect.

Unlike the *Daśarūpaka,* the *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* follows, while dealing subsequently with the items in

the *pratinirdeśa,* the same order as that in which they were originally mentioned in the *uddeśa.*

In this brief compendium of dramaturgy Kuravi Rāma displays his mastery of the subject and a thorough knowledge of the *Nāṭyaśāstra,* the *Daśarūpaka* and the *Avaloka.* The DP does not contain any discussion about the *rasa,*[6] the *nāyakas* and *nāyikās,* and their companions, etc. The *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati* is thus a short treatise on dramaturgy which can supply information on about 150 essential elements such as *arthaprakṛtis, pañcāvasthās,* five *sandhis, sandhyaṅgas, nāndī, dhruvā, paṭākṣepapraveśa, aśrāvya, niyataśrāvya, janānta, apavāritaka, ākāśabhāṣita,* etc., and the definitions of the ten varieties of the Sanskrit dramatic composition and their accessories.

THE EDITION OF THE TEXT

This edition is based on a single Palm-Leaf Manuscript of the text in Telugu characters preserved in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, with the number MSR. 820 (c). I am happy to express my grateful acknowledgements to Śrī R. K. Pārthasārathi, the Curator of the Library for his kind permission to me to have a copy of the work.

While editing the text I have sometimes used some of the modern punctuation-marks such as comma and semicolon. If in an uneven part of a verse a unit of sense is found to be complete I have used the semicolon to indicate the completion of the sentence and

6. There is only the following statement:
śṛṅgārādiprabhedena rasaḥ syād aṣṭadhā.

the fact that the portion preceding the semicolon is not connected with the subsequent expression. At the end of the first half of a verse I have used one sroke, and two strokes at the end of the second.

I would express my gratitude to the Chairman of the Department of East Asian Studies, and the authorities of the Research Administration of the University of Toronto, whose generous grant enabled me to travel and collect some unpublished manuscript materials, one of which was the text of the *Daśarūpaka-Paddhati*, now being presented with Occasional Notes in the following pages.

श्री कुरविरामकृता

दशरूपकपद्धतिः

श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः

अनवधिकरुणावारिधिमानम्यात्मनि सदाशिवं देवम् ।
व्युत्पित्सुमुदे कथयति दशरूपकवर्त्म कुरविरामकविः ॥ १ ॥

यद्यपि [1]पूर्वैः कथितञ्चैतद् दशरूपकादिषु तथापि ।
व्युत्पित्सूनामस्मिन् सुगमाय परं समारम्भः ॥ २ ॥

नटैः प्रतिनिधीभूय स्वैः स्वैरभिनयैः स्फुटम् ।
सभायां नेतृचारित्ररूपणाद् रूपकं मतम् ॥ ३ ॥

धीरोदात्तादिभेदेन नायको बहुधा मतः ।
नेतृणां चरितं प्राज्ञैरितिवृत्तमितीर्यते ॥ ४ ॥

प्रख्यातोत्पाद्यमिश्रप्रभेदात् तत् त्रिविधं मतम् ।
भारतादौ प्रसिद्धं तु प्रख्यातं; कविकल्पितम् ॥ ५ ॥

1. The reading in the MS is not clear. It looks like *yady api pūrvaṃ* (or *purvaire.*) .... *taddaśarūpkādiṣu tathāpi*.

उत्पाद्यम् ; एतत्साङ्कर्यान् मिश्रं ; सर्वं रसाश्रयम् ।
शृङ्गारादिप्रभेदेन रसः स्यादष्टधा ; त्विमौ ॥ ६ ॥

अन्यत्रविस्तरेणोक्ताविति नात्र प्रपञ्चितौ ।
नायकादिप्रभेदेन रूपकं दशधा विदुः ॥ ७ ॥

नाटकं च प्रकरणं भाणः[2] प्रहसनं डिमः ।
व्यायोगवीथिसमवकाराङ्केहामृगा दश ॥ ८ ॥

सन्धिवृत्त्यन्विताः सर्वे ; सन्धिरग्रे प्रदर्श्यते ।
कैशिक्याद्या वृत्तयस्तु ; तासामन्यत्र विस्तरः ॥ ९ ॥

धीरोदात्तो यत्र नेता शृङ्गारो वीर एव वा ।
रसः प्रधानम् , अन्येषां यथायोगमवस्थितिः ॥ १० ॥

2. The reading here seems to be in neuter as *bhāṇam*; but later on (v. 13) masculine form is clearly given.

प्रख्यातं वृत्तकं, सर्वे सन्धयस्तत्तु नाटकम् ।
यत्र नेता धीरशान्तः शृङ्गारस्य प्रधानता ॥ ११ ॥

पूर्ववच्चान्यद् उत्पा(द्यं) वृत्तं प्रकरणं हि तत् ।
नेता धूर्तविटो[3] यत्र सन्धी तु मुखनिर्वहौ ॥ १२ ॥

उत्पाद्यवृत्तम् (एकोऽ)ङ्कः सूच्यशृङ्गारवीरकः ।
स भाणो ; यत्र हास्यं तु रसोऽन्यद् भाणवद् भवेत् ॥ १३ ॥

शुद्धवैकृतसङ्कीर्णभेदात् प्रहसनं[4] त्रिधा ।
पाषण्डविप्रप्रभृतिचेटचेटीविटाकुलम् ॥ १४ ॥

वेषभाषादिसहितं शुद्धं हास्यवचोऽन्वितम् ।
कामुकादि(वचो)वेषैः षण्ढकञ्चुकितापसैः ॥ १५ ॥

3. In the DR *dhūrta* is not found as an adjective to the *viṭa*. But the N.S. has *dhūrtaviṭasamprayojyaḥ* (GOS, 18-110).

4. See the DR 3-54 and 55, p. 74.

कृतप्रहासाभिनयं विकृतं ; वीथिलक्षणम् ।
सङ्कीर्णं ; [5]यत्र प्रसिद्धं वृत्तं रौद्ररसो भवेत् ॥ १६ ॥

अन्येषां हास्यशृङ्गारवर्जानामङ्गता पुनः ।
नायका देवगन्धर्वपिशाचोरगराक्षसाः ॥ १७ ॥

भूतप्रेतमुखा दृप्ताः सन्धयो मर्शवर्जिताः ।
चत्वारोऽङ्का डिमस्य ; स्यादेको यत्र तु नायकः ॥ १८ ॥

5. If *yatra* is connected with previous expression, than the usual construction should have been by mentioning the *tat* and in a correct order as that *saṅkīrṇam* (*ucyate*) *vīthi-lakṣaṇaṃ yatra* (*asti*); or it would be better if the derivatives of *yat* and *tat* are left out, as Dhanika says *vīthyaṅgaiḥ* (*saṅkīrṇatvāt*) *saṅkīrṇam*. If on the other hand *yatra* is connected with the subsequent portion, as he generally does while introducing a new item (see v. 20), then also express mentioning of a form of *tat* is required according to Mammaṭa. Or we should take it that K.R. does not agree with Mammaṭa, and so a suitable form should be supplied. See for a discussion on the usages of *yat* and *tat* my paper "Gleanings from the *Kādambarī*", Journal of the Assam Research Society, v. XIV, p. 106.

सन्धयोऽगर्भमर्शाः स्युः, कथा स्यादेकवासरा ।
मायिकी,[6] डिमवच्चान्यत् स व्यायोगः स्मृतो बुधैः ॥ १९ ॥

यत्रेतिवृत्तम् उत्पाद्यम् अङ्कक्लृप्तिस्तु भाणवत् ।
शृङ्गारोऽपरिपूर्णश्च सा वीथिरिति कीर्तिता ॥ २० ॥

यत्र द्वादश नेतारः [7]फलदेवासुरादयः ।
वीरप्रधानाश्च रसा [8]उत्पाद्य मितिवृत्तकम् ॥ २१ ॥

सन्धयो मर्शहीनाः स्युस्त्रयोऽङ्कास्ते पुनः क्रमात ।
त्रैयामिकोत्सर्गदेवा[9][युंत्थ]च्छद्मकथात्रिकः ॥ २२ ॥

6. The reading in the MS is not clear. What is given above is my guess.

7. The verses dealing with *samavakāra* are a bit cumbersome. The reading in the MS in place is *caladevāsurādayaḥ*, of which *cala* is not clear in meaning. The DR and other texts record about the *phala* of the *nāyakas* in the *samavakāra* as "*phalaṃ teṣāṃ* (*dvādaśanāyakānāṃ*) *pṛthak pṛthak*. Therefore I think that the expression intended was perhaps *phaladevāsurādayaḥ* (taking the compound form to mean *phalayuktāḥ devāsurādayaḥ*).

8. See the Introduction on *itivṛtta* being *utpādya* in the *samavakāra*.

9. As the author himself states *trayo'ṅkās te punaḥ kramāt*, the three Acts in the *samavakāra* are to be respectively of the duration of three *yāmas*, one *yāma*, and of half *yāma*. But the three lines containing the expressions *traiyā-*

[10]यामिकाग्निनिरोधादिनिमित्तोपद्रवत्रिकः ।
अर्धयामिकश्शृङ्गारभाग्धर्मादिकथात्रिकः ॥ २३ ॥

सोऽसौ समवकारः स्याद् वीथ्यङ्गैः कैश्चिदन्वितः ।
प्राकृतो नायको यत्र प्रधानं करुणो रसः ॥ २४ ॥

प्रख्यातं वृत्तमङ्कस्य; [11]सन्ध्यङ्कौ भाणवन्मतौ ।
नेता धीरोद्धतो, वृत्तं मिश्रमीहामृगे ; रसः ॥ २५ ॥

[12]शृङ्गाराभासो ; मुखाद्याः सन्धयोऽङ्कद्वये[12a] त्रयः ।
अथैतेषामानुपूर्वीं वक्ष्ये प्रणयनान्विताम् ॥ २६ ॥

mika, yāmika, and *ardhayāmika* are examples of defective compounding, as subsequent expressions in each of the lines (i.e. compound forms) refer to all the three *aṅkas,* whereas the words *traiyāmika* etc. (which are part of the compounds) can only apply to one of the three. The construction of these three long compounds is not a happy one, and it looks like an unsuccessful attempt of a difficult somersault. As it is illegible in the MS, the reading shown within brackets is only my guess.

10. MS reads with one syllable less as *yāmikāgniṇirodhanimittopadravatrikaḥ.*
11. The reading in the MS appears like *vīthyaṅkau.*
12. See footnote 2 of the Introduction.
12a. About *īhāmṛga* there seem to be differences between the accounts found in the N.S., the DR, & the DP.

तत्राष्टभिर्द्वादशभिरष्टादशभिरेव वा ।
द्वाविंशत्या पदैर्नान्दी ; श्लोकः काव्यार्थसूचकः ॥ २७ ॥

सर्वेषामादिमोऽन्येऽत्र नेच्छन्ति नियमं तथा ।
सूत्रधारस्ततो रङ्गं प्रविश्य कतिभिर्नटैः ॥ २८ ॥

ऋतुं [13]स्तुवन् [प्ररोचयेत्] सेयमुक्ता प्ररोचना ।
सूचनी पात्रभेदानां[14] रसभावप्रकाशिनी ॥ २९ ॥

गीतिर्ध्रुवा ; कार्यभेदात् पञ्चधेयं प्रकीर्त्यते ।
प्रवेशसूचिकाङ्कादौ ध्रुवा प्रावेशिकी मता ॥ ३० ॥

प्रसङ्गमध्येऽन्यार्थस्याक्षेपाद् आक्षेपिकी मता ।
नैष्क्रामिकी तु पात्राणां ध्रुवा निष्क्रामसूचिका ॥ ३१ ॥

13. MS reads as
ṛtuṃ stūyan..........seyam uktā prarocanā.
14. Bhoja's statement on *dhruvā* is
seyaṃ pātrapravesarasanusandhānādiprayojanā dhruvā.
See V. Raghavan's work on S.P., edn, 1963, p. 605.

[15]प्रासादिकी स्यात् पात्राणां व्याकुलानां प्रसादनात् ।
विषादे विस्मये क्रोधे प्रवेशे सङ्गमे मते ॥ ३२ ॥

दोषप्रच्छादनादौ च गीयते या तु सान्तरी ।
सूत्रधारो नटाचार्यो, रङ्गो नाट्यसभा स्मृतः ॥ ३३ ॥

नटः पात्रं, तत् त्रिधा स्याद् उत्तमादिप्रभेदतः ।
उत्तमं नायकादिः स्याद्; अमात्यादिस्तु मध्यमः ॥ ३४ ॥

दासीविदूषकम्लेच्छप्रमुखं त्वधमं मतम् ।
ततः प्रस्तावना सैवामुखमित्युच्यते बुधैः ॥ ३५ ॥

सूत्रधारो नटीं ब्रूते मारिषं वा विदूषकम् ।
स्वकार्यं प्रस्तुताक्षेपि चित्रोक्त्या यत् तदामुखम् ॥ ३६ ॥

15. MS reads *prāsādhikī* and *prasādhanāt* in both the places.

कथोद्घातः प्रवृत्तं तत् प्रयोगातिशयस्त्रिधा ।
स्वेतिवृत्तसमं वाक्यमर्थं वा यत्र सूत्रतः ॥ ३७ ॥

गृहीत्वा प्रविशेत् पात्रं स कथोद्घात ईरितः ।
प्रस्तूयमानकालस्य गुणवर्णनया स्वतः ॥ ३८ ॥

प्रविशेत् सूचितं पात्रं यत्र तत् स्यात् प्रवृत्तकम् ।
'एषोऽयम्' इत्युपक्षेपी प्रयोगातिशयो मतः ॥ ३९ ॥

वीथ्या अङ्गान्यामुखस्यापीत्येषां लक्ष्म चक्ष्महे ।
उद्घात्यकावलगिते प्रपञ्चत्रिगते छलम् ॥ ४० ॥

वाक्केल्यधिबले गण्डम् अवस्पन्दितनालिके ।
असत्प्रलापव्याहारमृदवानि त्रयोदश ॥ ४१ ॥

तत्रोद्घात्यं निगूढार्थं द्विधा प्रश्नोत्तरात्मना ।
अन्यकार्यच्छद्मनान्यकार्यस्य करणं तथा ॥ ४२ ॥

तेन प्रस्तुतकार्यस्य द्विधावलगितं मतम् ।
मिथ्यास्तोत्रं प्रपञ्चः स्यात् ; पूर्वरङ्गे नटादिभिः ॥ ४३ ॥

सम्भूयानेककार्याणां करणं त्रिगतं मतम् ।
वाक्यैर्बहिःप्रियैरन्तर्विप्रियैर्लोभनं छलम् ॥ ४४ ॥

साकाङ्क्षस्यापि वाक्यस्य नटाद्यैर्यन्निवर्तनम् ।
उक्तिप्रत्युक्तिभेदेन वाक्केलिर्द्विविधा मता ॥ ४५ ॥

[16]मिथ्याक्षेपोऽधिबलं ; गण्डं प्रस्तुतबाधिवाक् ।
रसादुक्तान्यथा व्याख्या त्ववस्पन्दितमीरितम् ॥ ४६ ॥

प्रहेलिका दुर्बोधार्था[17], सोपहासा तु नालिका ।
असम्बद्धकथासत्प्रलापो ; लोभोपहासवाक् ॥ ४७ ॥

16. *adhibala* and *gaṇḍa* (which is given in masculine in the DR) are defined by Dhanañjaya thus:
anyonyavākyādhikyoktiḥ spardhayādhibalaṃ bhavet
and
gaṇḍaḥ prastutasaṃbandhibhinnārthaṃ sahasoditam
(pp. 67 & 68)

व्याहारो ; मृदवं दोषगुणीकरणमीरितम् ।
यथासम्भवमत्रैषु केषाञ्चिद् ग्राह्यतां विदुः ॥ ४८ ॥

प्रस्तावनानन्तरं स्यादितिवृत्तप्रकाशनम् ।
तच्च द्विधा भवेत् सूच्यमसूच्यं चान्तिमं पुनः ॥ ४९ ॥

दृश्यं श्राव्यमिति द्वेधा ; तथैवान्तिममेतयोः ।
अश्राव्यं नियतश्राव्यमिति द्विविधमिष्यते ॥ ५० ॥

अश्राव्यमन्यैरज्ञेयम् ; आत्मन्येव स्थितं तु यत् ।
तदात्मगतमित्युक्त्वा काव्यबन्धे निवेशयेत् ॥ ५१ ॥

यद् एकेनैव विज्ञेयं [18]नियतश्राव्यमीर्यते ।
एतच्च द्विविधं प्रोक्तं जनान्तश्चापवारितम् ॥ ५२ ॥

17. The DR says
sopahāsā nigūḍhārthā nālikaiva prahelikā (p. 68).

18. Though the expression *niyataśrāvya* does not seem to occur in the N.S., the two types *janānta* and *apavārita* are defined there (GOS, 25-89 & 90; p. 281). See Abhinava's comment on this.

गुह्यं गुह्यतरञ्चेति जनान्तमपि च द्विधा ।
स्याज्जनान्तिकमित्युक्त्वा वाच्यं पूर्वं ; परं पुनः ॥ ५३ ॥

कर्णे एवमिवेत्युक्त्वा ज्ञाप्य पश्चात् प्रसङ्गतः ।
प्रकाशमित्युक्त्वैतेषामन्तेऽन्यार्थः प्रयुज्यते ॥ ५४ ॥

अप्रविष्टैः सहालापो यस्तद् आकाशभाषितम् ।
किं ब्रवीषीत्यनूद्यैतत् पश्चात् कार्यं तदुत्तरम् ॥ ५५ ॥

दूराध्वानं वधं युद्धं राज्यदेशादिविप्लवम् ।
निरोधं सुरतं स्नानं भोजनञ्चानुलेपनम् ॥ ५६ ॥

अंशुकग्रहणादीनि प्रत्यक्षाणि न निर्दिशेत् ।
समाजोद्वेगकारीति तद् एतत् सूच्यमुच्यते ॥ ५७ ॥

विष्कम्भचूलिकाङ्कास्यप्रवेशाङ्कावतारणैः ।
सूच्यस्य सूचनं पञ्चविधमाहुर्मनीषिणः ॥ ५८ ॥

वृत्तवर्तिष्यमाणानां कथांशानां निदर्शकः ।
सङ्क्षेपार्थस्तु विष्कम्भो मध्यपात्रप्रयोजितः ॥ ५९ ॥

[19]एकभाषान्वितः शुद्धो मिश्रोऽन्य इति स द्विधा ।
अन्तर्यवनिकासंस्थैश्चूलिकार्थस्य सूचना ॥ ६० ॥

19. The previous line *saṃkṣepārthas tu* etc. is the same as that in the DR 1-59. About the two types of *viṣkaṃbhaka* (Explanatory Scene) the DR and Dhanika's comment thereon run as follows:

> *ekānekakṛtaḥ śuddhaḥ saṅkīrṇo nīcamadhyamaiḥ* (1-60). *ekena dvābhyāṃ vā madhyamapātrābhyāṃ śuddho bhavati. madhyamādhamapātrair yugapat prayojitaḥ saṅkīrṇa iti.*

The N.S. also records similarly 18-55. The above remarks explain that the mixture of low and middle class characters makes the *saṅkīrṇa-viṣkambha* different from the pure type in which only middle class characters participate. In this context the statement of the DP.

> *ekabhāṣānvitaḥ śuddho miśro'nya iti sa dvidhā*

seems to explain the difference on the basis of employment of one or more languages respectively in the pure and the mixed types of *viṣkambha*. Whether Sanskrit is meant by *ekabhāṣa* or any language is not made clear. Vidyānātha says clearly about these as

> *kevalasaṃskṛtaprāyaḥ śuddhaḥ; saṃskṛtaprākṛtamiśritaḥ saṅkīrṇaḥ.* (Bālamanoramā Press edn., p. 82).

If this be the intention of Kuravi Rāma also, then there may not be any point of difference, as his statement would mean that Sanskrit is the language spoken in the pure type, and Sanskrit and Prakrit in the mixed type, the latter being the language generally allotted for the *nīcapātras* in all the texts.

अङ्कान्तपात्रैरङ्कास्यमुत्तराङ्कार्थसूचनम् ।
नीचपात्रप्रयुक्तस्तु विष्कम्भः स्यात् प्रवेशकः ॥ ६१ ॥

[20]नैवाङ्क आद्ये ; यत्रोत्तराङ्कार्थः पूर्वसङ्गतः ।
असूचिताङ्कपात्रं तद् अङ्कावतरणं मतम् ॥ ६२ ॥

नेपथ्यं स्याद् यवनिका पात्राणां आवृतिर्मतम् ।
हर्षशोकादिसञ्जातसम्भ्रमादित्वरान्वितम् ॥ ६३ ॥

पटाक्षेपात् प्रविशति पात्रम् ; अन्यत् स्वभावतः ।
पात्रं ; दृश्यं त्वभिनयेत् सन्ध्यङ्गपरिनिष्ठितम् ॥ ६४ ॥

[21]एकप्रयोजनोपेतकथांशानामवान्तरैः ।
प्रयोजनैर्यः सम्बन्धः सन्धिरेष तु पञ्चधा ॥ ६५ ॥

20. The MS reads *naiṣāṅka ādye* which is obviously a scribal error.
21. See the Introduction.

मुखं प्रतिमुखं गर्भो विमर्शो निर्वहस्तथा ।
मुखं बीजसमुत्पत्तिर्नानार्था रससम्भवा ॥ ६६ ॥

[22]लक्ष्यालक्ष्यस्य बीजस्य व्यक्तिः प्रतिमुखं मतम् ।
गर्भस्तु दृष्टनष्टस्य बीजस्यान्वेषणं मुहुः ॥ ६७ ॥

गर्भसन्धौ प्रसिद्धस्य बीजार्थस्यावमर्शनम् ।
हेतुना येन केनापि विमर्शः सन्धिरिष्यते ॥ ६८ ॥

बीजवन्तो मुखाद्यर्था विप्रकीर्णा यथायथम् ।
ऐकार्थ्यमुपनीयन्ते यत्र निर्वहणं हि तत् ॥ ६९ ॥

22. The DR has

lakṣyālakṣyatayodbhedas tasya pratimukhaṃ bhavet (1-30)

which is explained by Dhanika as

tasya bījasya kiñcillakṣyaḥ kiñcidalakṣya ivodbhedaḥ prakāśanam, where *lakṣyālakṣya* is taken to qualify *udbheda*, whereas the DP makes it an adjective of *bīja*.

बीजबिन्दुपताकाख्यप्रकरीकार्यलक्षणाः ।
आरम्भयत्नप्राप्त्याशानियताप्तिफलागमाः ॥ ७० ॥

अर्थप्रकृतयः पूर्वं, तदवस्थाः परे स्मृताः ।
[23]क्रमाद् द्वयोर्द्वयोर्योगात् सन्धयः स्युर्मुखादयः ॥ ७१ ॥

स्तोकोद्दिष्टः कार्यहेतुर्बीजं विस्तार्यनेकधा ।
अवान्तरार्थविच्छेदे बिन्दुरच्छेदकारणम् ॥ ७२ ॥

प्रतिपाद्यकथाङ्गं स्यात् पताका व्यापिनी कथा ।
अव्यापिनी प्रकरिका; [24]कार्यं निर्वहकृत् फले ॥ ७३ ॥

औत्सुक्यमात्रमारम्भः फललाभाय भूयसे ।
प्रयत्नस्तु तदप्राप्तौ व्यापारोऽतित्वरान्वितः ॥ ७४ ॥

23. See DR 1-22, and Dhanika's explanation.
24. See N.S. 19-26, and Abhinava's comment thereon.

उपायापायचिन्ताभ्यां प्राप्त्याशा सा; तदुद्भवे ।
[25]उपायलाभतः कार्यनिश्चयो नियताप्तिता ॥ ७५ ॥

समग्रफलसम्पत्तिः फलागम उदाहृतः ।
द्वादशाङ्गानि बीजारम्भानुगुण्यान् मुखस्य तु ॥ ७६ ॥

उपक्षेपः परिकरः परिन्यासो विलोभनम् ।
युक्तिः प्राप्तिः समाधानं विधानं परिभावनम् ॥ ७७ ॥

उद्भेदभेदकरणान्येतेषां लक्ष्म चक्ष्महे ।
उपक्षेपं न्यासमाहुर्; बीजस्यास्य बहूक्तितः ॥ ७८ ॥

भवेत् परिकरो; जन्म परिन्यासो; गुणस्तुतिः ।
विलोभनं स्यात्; [25a]सालम्ब्य(?) विचारो युक्तिरीरिता ॥ ७९ ॥

25. While defining this the DR seems to lay stress on the absence of obstacles when it says

apāyābhāvataḥ prāptir niyatāptiḥ suniścitā,

on which see Dhanika's comment and illustration.

25a. The DR has *sampradhāraṇam arthānāṃ yuktiḥ.*

सौख्यसम्पादनं प्राप्तिः; नैपुण्यात्करणं तु यत् ।
समाधानं ; विधानं तु कारणं सुखदुःखयोः ॥ ८० ॥

परिभावनमाश्चर्यावेशो ; व्यक्तं प्रकाशनम् ।
उद्भेदः स्याद् ; भवेद् भेदो गुणप्रोत्साहनं ; कृतिः ॥ ८१ ॥

बीजानुगुण्यात् प्रकृतकार्यारम्भोऽत्र चादिमाः ।
[26]त्रयो युक्त्युद्भेदसमाधानान्याहुः प्रधानतः ॥ ८२ ॥

त्रयोदशाङ्गानि [27]बिन्दुयत्नयुक्सन्धिगान्यथ ।
विलासः परिसर्पश्च विधूतं शमनर्मणी ॥ ८३ ॥

नर्मद्युतिः प्रगमनं विरोधः पर्युपासनम् ।
वज्रं पुष्पमुपन्यासो वर्णसंहार इत्यपि ॥ ८४ ॥

26. See the Introduction.

27. *binduyatnayuk sandhi* is *pratimukhasandhi*.

सम्भोगेच्छा विलासः स्याद् ; [28]दृष्टनष्टानुसर्पणम् ।
परिसर्पोऽनिष्टवस्तुनिक्षेपः स्याद् विधूतकम् ॥ ८५ ॥

शमोऽरतेरुपशमो ; नर्म स्यात् परिहासवाक् ।
अनुरागोद्घाटनोत्था प्रीतिर्नर्मद्युतिः स्मृता ॥ ८६ ॥

वाक्यानुवाक्यैः स्वस्यानुरागबीजप्रकाशनम् ।
प्रगमः ; छद्मनाभीष्टागमरोधो[29] विरोधकः ॥ ८७ ॥

पर्युपासनमिष्टस्य जनस्यानुनयो भवेत् ।
वज्रं निष्ठुरवाक् ; पुष्पमनुरागोल्बणं वचः ॥ ८८ ॥

28. The MS reads *dṛṣṭanaṣṭo'vasarpaṇam.* See DR 1-32.

29. The MS reads
pragamacchadmanāniṣṭāgamarodho virodhakaḥ.
The N.S. has
yā tu vyasanasamprāptiḥ sa nirodhaḥ prakīrtitaḥ
(GOS, 19-79).
See Abhinava's comment on this *vyasanam atra khedamātram abhīṣṭoparodhān nirodhaḥ.* (Footnote shows the reading of *virodha* also.) The DR says *hitarodho nirodhanam* (1-34). See Dhanika's comment and illustration.

उपन्यासो भवेद् रागहेतुवाक्यप्रपञ्चनम् ।
चातुर्वर्ण्यप्रवचनं वर्णसंहार इष्यते ॥ ८९ ॥

परिसर्पप्रगमवज्रोपन्यासाश्च पुष्पकम् ।
मुख्यान्यत्राथ गर्भस्य पताकाप्त्याशिकायुजः ॥ ९० ॥

अभूताहरणं मार्गो रूपोदाहरणक्रमाः ।
सङ्ग्रहश्चानुमानश्च तोटकाधिबले तथा ॥ ९१ ॥

उद्वेगसम्भ्रमाक्षेपा द्वादशाङ्गान्यनुक्रमात् ।
अभूताहरणं प्रस्तुतोपयोगि च्छलाश्रयम्[30] ॥ ९२ ॥

मार्गो याथार्थ्यकथनं ; रूपमूहोदयं वचः ।
प्रस्तुतोत्कर्षाभिधानं स्याद् उदाहरणं ; क्रमः ॥ ९३ ॥

30. The MS reads *chalārjavam*. The DR has *abhūtāharaṇaṃ chadma* (1-38).

चिन्तिताप्तिः ; प्रस्तुतोपयोगि वाक्यं तु सङ्ग्रहः ।
लिङ्गादभ्यूहनञ्चानुमानं ; रोषाद् भयोदितम् ॥ ९४ ॥

तोटकं स्याद् ; अधिबलमिति वञ्चनमीरितम् ।
[31]अपकारिजनाद् भीतिरुद्वेगः ; सम्भ्रमः पुनः ॥ ९५ ॥

शङ्कात्रासौ ; अथाक्षेप इष्टार्थोपायसङ्ग्रहः ।
आद्यौ द्वौ तोटकाक्षेपाधिबलान्यत्र मुख्यतः ॥ ९६ ॥

विदुर्विमर्शस्याङ्गानि नित्याप्तिप्रकरीयुजः ।
तत्रापवादः सम्फेटो विद्रवद्रवशक्तयः ॥ ९७ ॥

द्युतिः प्रसङ्गश्छलनं व्यवसायो विरोधनम् ।
प्ररोचनं विचलनम् आदानञ्च त्रयोदश ॥ ९८ ॥

31. The MS reads *upakārijanāt* which is obviously a scribal mistake.

अपवादस्तु दोषाणां प्रख्यापनमुदाहृतः ।
रोषालापस्तु सम्फेटो ; विद्रवः स्याद् वधादिकम् ॥ ९९ ॥

द्रवो गुरुतिरस्कारः ; शक्तिर्वैरिनिरासनम् ।
तर्जनोद्वेजनद्वन्द्वं द्युतिः स्याद् ; गुरुकीर्तनम् ॥ १०० ॥

प्रसङ्गं प्राहुर् ; अवमाननं छलनमीरितम् ।
व्यवसायः स्वसामर्थ्यप्रशंसनमुदाहृतम् ॥ १०१ ॥

[31a]क्रोधसंरब्धयोरन्योन्याधिक्षेपो विरोधनम् ।
सिद्धवद् [32]भावियच्छ्रेयःकथनं स्यात् प्ररोचनम् ॥ १०२ ॥

31a. The MS reads *krodhasaṃbaddhayoḥ*. The DR has *saṃrabdhānāṃ virodhanam.* (1-47).

32. The meaning intended seems to be *bhāvinaḥ śreyasaḥ kathanaṃ yat tat.* But it is a cumbersome expression.

स्वगुणाविष्कृतिः स्यात् विचलनं ; कार्यसङ्ग्रहः ।
[33]आदानं ; निर्वहस्याङ्गान्यथ कार्यफलस्पृशः ॥ १०३ ॥

सन्धिर्विबोधो[34] ग्रथनं निर्णयः परिभाषणम् ।
प्रसादानन्दसमयाः कृतिर्भाषोपगूहने ॥ १०४ ॥

पूर्वभावोपसंहारो प्रशस्तिश्च चतुर्दश ।
बीजोपगमनं सन्धिर्विबोधः कार्यमार्गणम् ॥ १०५ ॥

कार्योपक्षेपणं प्राहुर्ग्रथनं ; निर्णयः पुनः ।
बीजानुगुणकार्यस्य प्रख्यापनम् ; अथो मिथः ॥ १०६ ॥

33. The MS reads *āhānam.*

34. The MS has *virodha.* The GOS edition of the N.S. gives the readings of *virodha* and *nirodha.* The DR reads *vibodha* (1-49).

जल्पनं परिभाषा स्यात्; प्रसादः पर्युपासनम्।
आनन्दो वाञ्छितप्राप्तिः; समयो दुःखनाशनम्॥ १०७॥

कृतिर्लब्धस्थिरीकारः; प्राप्तकार्यानुमोदनम्।
आभाषणं; विचिन्तितार्थप्राप्तिः स्याद् उपगूहनम्॥ १०८॥

इष्टकार्येक्षणं पूर्वभावः; कार्योपसंहृतिः[35]।
संहारः स्यात्; प्रशस्तिस्तु शुभाशंसनमीरितम्॥१०९॥

दशोत्तरशतश्लोकैर्दशरूपकपद्धतिः।
दर्शिता साधु कुरविकुलक्षीराम्बुधीन्दुना॥ ११०॥
[36]रामसङ्ख्यावता; कृत्या प्रीयतां शङ्करोऽनया॥ ११०½॥

श्रीपरमेश्वरार्पणमस्तु।

35. The MS reads *kāryopasaṃhṛtiḥ*. The N.S. (19-103) and the DR (1-54) read *kāvyasaṃhāraḥ*.

36. Amara says *saṅkhyāvān paṇḍitaḥ kaviḥ*. So *rāmasaṅkhyāvatā* is in the sense of *rāmakavinā*. From the adjective *kuravikulakṣīrāmbudhīndunā* it is clear that *kuravi* is the family name of our author.

दशरूपकपद्धतौ निर्दिष्टानां पारिभाषिकांशानां सूची

(सङ्ख्याः श्लोकसम्बन्धिन्यः)

अङ्क (रूपकेष्वन्यतमम्–तस्य लक्षणम्)	२४-२५
अङ्कावतरण	६२
अङ्कास्य	६१
अधमपात्र	३५
अधिबल	४६
अपवारितक	५३-५४
अर्थप्रकृति	७०-७१
अवलगित	४२-४३
अवस्पन्दित	४६
अश्राव्य	५१
असत्प्रलाप	४७
आकाशभाषित	५५
आक्षेपिकी ध्रुवा	३१
आन्तरी ध्रुवा	३२-३३
आमुख (प्रस्तावना)	३५-३६
आरम्भ	७४
इतिवृत्त	४
ईहामृग (तस्य लक्षणम्)	२४-२६
उत्तमपात्र	३४
उत्पाद्य (इतिवृत्त)	६

उद्घात्य ४२
कथोद्घात ३७-३८
कार्य ७३
गण्ड ४६
गर्भसन्धि ६७
गर्भाङ्ग (द्वादशाङ्गानि) ९०-९६
चूलिका ६०
छल ४४
जनान्त (जनान्तिक) ५३
डिम (तस्य लक्षणम्) १६-१८
त्रिगत ४३-४४
ध्रुवा (तस्या लक्षणम्) २९-३०
नट ३४
नाटक (तस्य लक्षणम्) ९-११
नान्दी (तस्या लक्षणम्) २७
नायक ४
नियतश्राव्य ५२
नियताप्ति ७५
निर्वहणसन्धि ६९
निर्वहाङ्ग (चतुर्दशाङ्गानि) १०३-१०९
नेपथ्य ६३
नैष्क्रामिकी ध्रुवा ३१
पञ्चावस्था ७०-७१
पटाक्षेपप्रवेश ६३-६४
पताका ७३

प्रकरण(तस्य लक्षणम्) ११-१२
प्रकरी ७३
प्रख्यात (इतिवृत्त) ५
प्रतिमुखसन्धि ६७
प्रतिमुखाङ्ग (त्रयोदशाङ्गानि) ८३-९०
प्रत्यक्षनिर्देशानर्ह ५६-५७
प्रपञ्च ४३
प्रयत्न ७४
प्रयोगातिशय ३९
प्ररोचना २८-२९
प्रवृत्त (प्रवृत्तक) ३८-३९
प्रवेशक ६१
प्रहसन १३-१६
प्रहेलिका ४७
प्राप्त्याशा ७५
प्रावेशिकी ध्रुवा ३०
प्रासादिकी ध्रुवा ३२
फलागम ७६
बिन्दु ७२
बीज ७२
भाण (तस्य लक्षणम्) १२-१३
मध्यमपात्र ३४
मिश्र (इतिवृत्त) ६
मुखसन्धि ६६
मुखाङ्ग (द्वादशाङ्गानि) ७७-८२

मृदव	३८
रस	६
रङ्ग	३३
रूपक (तस्य लक्षणम्)	३
रूपक (दश रूपकाणि)	८
वाक्केलि	४५
विमर्शसन्धि	६८
विमर्शाङ्ग (त्रयोदशाङ्गानि)	९७-१०३
विष्कम्भ	५९-६०
वीथि (तस्या लक्षणम्)	२०
वीथ्यङ्ग	४०-४१
व्यायोग	१८-१९
व्याहार	४७-४८
सन्धि (तस्य लक्षणम्)	६५-६६
समवकार (तस्य लक्षणम्)	२१-२४
सूत्रधार	३२

Appendix I

A DIFFICULT ILLUSTRATIVE VERSE IN THE *DAŚARŪPĀVALOKA*

APPENDIX I

*A DIFFICULT ILLUSTRATIVE VERSE IN THE *DAŚARŪPĀVALOKA*

In my article on the *Daśarūpaka* published in the Journal of the University of Gauhati, Vol. XI, 1960 (ARTS), I tried to discuss some of the problems connected with Dhanika's *Avaloka* on the *Daśarūpaka*. I could not find then definite solutions to many of the problems, and I only offered my suggestions in several cases, and in one case I produced some intepretations that were supplied to me by some well-known scholars in the field when I referred the matter to them. One of the problems I was struggling hard to find a solution to, was a Prakrit[1] verse given by Dhanika in the fourth chapter under *kārikā* 34 (page 91, N. S. P. edition, 1941).

The text of the verse as available in print was highly unintelligible, and before publishing my paper I wrote to Professor Dr. A. N. Upādhye of Kolhapur, requesting him to furnish me with the *chāyā* of the verse under reference and the source thereof etc. if possible. On receiving my letter Professor Upādhye also consulted some of his friends in this matter, and supplied me with a *chāyā* of his own rendering and a second one by one of them. These two *chāyās* and the interpretations were purely tentative, and I produced them as such with the same remark in my paper on the *Daśarūpaka* referred to above.

*Paper read at the meeting of the American Oriental Society, Berkeley, California, March, 1968.

1. I am using the word Prakrit in a general way in the sense of any vernacular derived from and akin to Sanskrit, including even the lowest forms of the dialect, just as the one in the expression *Prākṛta-vyākaraṇa* used by Trivikrama and Hemacandra covers all dialects including Apabhraṃśa.

Several years after the publication of that paper containing the two *chāyās* and the possible interpretations conveyed by Dr Upādhye and Dr P. L. Vaidya, I noticed recently a[2] paper on the same verse appearing in the H. D. Velankar Commemoration Volume which was published in October, 1965. The writer of this paper remarks on page 197 thus "No modern commentator or scholar has offered, to my knowledge, any interpretation of the verse." The odd thing about this, as I understand from a recent letter (November 8, 1967) written to me by Professor A. N. Upādhye, is that this person was also one of the many to whom this verse together with the problems raised by me, was shown by Professor Upādhye. Therefore it is surprising that no acknowledgement of any sort or reference to Dr Upādhye and Dr Vaidya, or to the tentative inter-

2. The title of the paper "An obscure Apabhraṁśa verse quoted in the *Daśarūpa*" is not accurate. The verse occurs in the *Avaloka*, and not in the *Daśarūpa*. Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha says in the beginning

Daśarūpasya yā vyākhyā dhanikena samīritā,
tasyā bhaṭṭanṛsiṃhena laghvī ṭīkā vidhīyate |

One or two points in the paper, though very minor, are surprising, and therefore I should like to pointing them out here, with the intention of facilitating future corrections. The writer of that paper says on p. 197.

(a) "The commentator of the *Avaloka* is constrained to remark: *nitānta-asphuṭatvād asya ślokasya vyākhyā na likhyate asmābhiḥ.*" The spacing in the compound-form is of course given by the writer of the paper. This remark was not made by the commentator (or the author) of the *Avaloka*, but it was by the editor of the text. No commentary on the *Avaloka* was published by the N. S. Press, and the above sentence seems to have been quoted from the N.S.P. edition of the *Daśarūpaka*, though there is no reference to the particular edition from which he has quoted this.

(b) On page 198 (and twice again on page 200) he gives the ablative and genitive form of *anya* in feminine in Sanskrit as *anyāyāḥ* (in the last but one paragraph). *Anya* being a pronoun, the form should have been *anyasyāḥ*.

pretations supplied by them, appears in this recent article of the year 1965. Instead of making the necessary acknowledgement and a reference to these scholars, his remarks to the contrary (quoted above) seem to be unfair and unscholarly.

He has collected some different readings of the verse in the *Avaloka,* and has tried to explain its meaning and application in the context. Instead of reproducing his interpretations and the details, I should like to request the interested readers to see for themselves the paper appearing in the H. D. Velankar Commemoration Volume.

Now I should turn to the problem of the original verse and the *chāyā* and to the possible solution that I have been able to gather from genuine sources. Even after the publication of my paper in 1960, many of the problems in the *Avaloka* have not ceased to engage my attention. Dhanika's *Avaloka* is a highly learned Commentary, and naturally it bristles with many difficulties to which the defective editions available in print add further, and consequently I found it very hard to overcome these difficulties without the help of a suitable sub-commentary. In my search for such a help, only recently I was able to get the transcripts of Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's Commentary, called *Laghuṭīkā,* on the *Avaloka.* I have just completed working on this *Laghuṭīkā* and the *Daśarūpāvaloka.*[2a] I feel that though

2a. I am glad to inform that the authorities of the Adyar Library and Research Centre, Madras, are publishing soon the entire work on the *Daśarūpaka,* consisting of the text, the *Avaloka* with corrections in 347 places, the brilliant commentary of Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha, an Introduction and two separate Footnotes, etc. The work will appear as number 97 of the well-known Adyar Library Series, and may come to about 360 pages in Demy Octavo size.

very brief the commentary seems to prove very useful in settling the various readings and the interpretations of the text of the *Avaloka*.

In the case of this difficult Apabhraṃśa verse also some welcome light is thrown by Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha, and it is he who comes to our help in getting a solution for the first time to this otherwise unyielding and intractable illustration. I submit here what I have been able to collect from the manuscript material of his *laghuṭīkā* in this connection. Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha gives this Apabhraṃśa verse with a different reading, and its *chāyā*.[3] I quote the portion here, with some corrections effected by me, consisting of the verse and the Sanskrit *chāyā* together with his comments thereon.

(भट्टनृसिंहस्य लघुटीका)

व्यवधानेन अविरोधमुदाहरन्ति :—

अण्णाउ [4]ताउ महिला जइ परिमलसुअंधु ।

मइ कंतह अल्लीणउ[4] वणवीसअगंधु ॥

3. The reading of the verse available in print without *chāyā* is this:

aṇṇahuṇāhumaheliahujuhuparimalususuaṃdhu,
muhukaṃtaha agatthahaaṃga ṇa phiṭṭai gaṃdhu |

4. The spacing in this verse is mine. The manuscript reads in a continuous way. Sometimes in the Telugu Ms an *anusvāra* or *anusvāra*-like symbol (or zero called *nolli*, according to Dr Upādhye in his letter who adds that it was the case with Kannaḍa manuscripts too—I noticed it also in the Grantha MS—) is used before a consonant to indicate that the following consonant is to be duplicated. Consequent on this practice the two words *aṃṇāu* and *aṃlīṇau* are found with this symbol, and I have given them in the text with the consonants duplicated.

(छाया)

अन्यास्ता महिला यथा परिमलसुगन्धाः
मम कान्तस्य आश्रितो[5] व्रणविस्रगन्धः ॥

अत्रान्यासामसौभाग्यं[6] तत्प्रियतमानामशौर्यञ्च स्वसौभाग्यप्रकटनेन स्वभर्तुः[7] शौर्यप्रकटनेन च स्वात्मनो निन्दाव्याजेन[7] काचिद् ब्रूते । अन्याः खलु ताः स्त्रियो यासामङ्गरागानुकूलश्चिरस्थायी परिमलः । मम तु निर्भाग्यायाः कृतेऽप्यङ्गरागे भर्तृव्रणकृतविस्रगन्ध एवेत्यर्थः ।

In the *Avaloka* Dhanikas' remarks on this verse run thus.

इत्यत्र बीभत्सस्य अङ्गभूतरसान्तरव्यवधानेन शृङ्गारे समावेशो न विरुद्धः ।

While explaining the verse IV-34 of the *Daśarūpaka* containing the definition of *sthāyibhāva,* Dhanika's *Avaloka* has a lengthy and a very learned discussion related to the topic. A part of the discussion is devoted to the question of opposition or incompatibility (*virodha*)

(1) between *sthāyibhāvas* and *vyabhicāribhāvas,* and
(2) between *two sthāyibhāvas.*

Of the second type again two possibilities are mentioned.

(a) One is an instance where, though the two are incompatible, one *sthāyibhāva* is *aṅgin* and the other an *aṅga,* and the *ālambanavibhāvas* of the two are different;

5. The Telugu manuscript reads *āśrite,* but Madras Govt. transcript, Adyar Grantha Ms. and the Trivandrum transcript — all give *āśrito,* and so I have given this.

6. The Telugu Ms reads *atrāsām* etc. Madras Govt. transcript reads *atrānyāsām,* whereas the Trivandrum transcript gives *yadanyāsām.* I Preferred *atrānyāsām.*

7. The portion from *svabhartuḥ* to *nindāvyājena* is left out in the Telugu Ms, whereas the Madras transcript, the Adyar Grantha Ms and the Trivandrum transcript—all these contain the reading.

(b) and the second may be a case where again, of the two incompatibles, one *sthāyibhāva* is *aṅgin* and the other an *aṅga*, and the *ālambanavibhāvas* of the two are not different, but one and the same.

Here Dhanika says that the first instance of the second type is all right, and it is possible to have in a composition (descriptions of appropriate elements of) such incompatible *rasas* (or the *sthāyibhāvas*[8] as is understood from the expression in the context) because of the fact that the *ālambanavibhāvas* are different; and that the second instance of the second type should be avoided (*Avaloka* has this sentence *viruddharasaikālambanatvam eva virodhahetuḥ;* and on this *Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha* comments *sthāyino rasasya aṅgabhūtair api rasāntarair ekāśrayatvaṃ pariharaṇīyam ity arthaḥ.* See Appendix II). Or, says Dhanika, this too may be possible in spite of the fact that the *ālambanavibhāva* of the two is one and the same, if there be (appropriate elements of) a third intervening *rasa* which is *not incompatible* with either of the two. (The following remark of Dhanika: *sa tv aviruddharasāntaravyavadhānenopanibadhyamāno na virodhī* is introduced by Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha thus: *kiṃ tat sarvathā tyajanīyam eva teṣām ekāśrayatvam ? nety. āha – sa tv iti*). Otherwise, without the intervention of such a third *rasa* the second instance of the second type should be avoided. (Dhanika remarks *prakārāntareṇa ekāśrayavirodhaḥ*

8. As it is the *sthāyibhāva* which when fully developed becomes the *rasa,* the term *rasa* is also used in this context to stand for the *sthāyibhāva.* A similar usage of the term is found in other treatises too, and it is so explained by Abhinava as well (*bhāvinīṃ vṛttim āśritya odanaṃ pacatītivad*).

parihartavyaḥ, and on this Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha comments *prakārāntareṇa=avyavadhānena,* i.e. *aviruddha-rasāntarāvyavadhānena*).

The Prakrit verse in the context is given by Dhanika for the second instance of the second type with the intervention of a third *rasa,* which is not incompatible with the *aṅgin* as well as the *aṅgarasa,* and of this verse Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's *lakhuṭīkā* gives the above reading, the *chāyā* and his own comments.

Even in the reading as given by Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha I felt some difficulty in the fourth *pāda* of the Prakrit verse. After referring this point to him I got a kind reply from Professor Dr Upādhye, the relevant contents of which I shall be mentioning soon. The point of difficulty is this. I learn from the *Prākṛta–Śabda–Mahārṇava* (P.S.M.) that *vissa* or *vīsa* are the Prakrit forms for the *visra* of Sanskrit. The *chāyā* in the manuscripts clearly reads as (*vraṇa*)–*visragandhaḥ* for which the Prakrit form should have been (*vaṇa*)-*vissagaṃdhu* or *vīsagaṃdhu.* But the reading in a manuscript (Telugu) seems to contain the spelling as (*vaṇa*)*vīsa*^{ra}*agaṃdhu.* And here again the syllable "ra" (it looks like "ra") is seen in a smaller size and slightly above the level of the other letters. It was perhaps inserted by the scribe later, though there is no insertion mark visible.

I. It was not clear to me as to whether I should take the form as *vīsaraagaṃdhu* or *vīsaagaṃdhu* or *vīsagaṃdhu.* Sometimes in the Prakrit forms *svārthe kaḥ* (Cf. Trivikrama's *Prākṛta–vyākaraṇa–vṛtti* 2-1-18) is permitted of which only "a" remains (except in the Paiśācī where the entire form is said to be retained), although the corresponding Sanskrit form may not

actually have the similar *svārthe kaḥ.*[9] The examples given are *candraḥ=can dao,* and *iha=ihaa* (Trivikrama, 2–1–18).

II. About the metre of the verse too I had my doubts. From looking into Hemacandra's *Chando'nuśāsana,* I thought it might be *pañcānanalalitā* (*same daśa oje dvādaśa pañcānanalalitā,* p. 204, edited by Professor Velankar, 1961, i.e. ten and twelve *mātrās* in the even and odd *pādas* respectively). On my request for a clarification on these points Professor Upādhye was kind enough to write to me (on November 8, 1967) stating that *vīsaraagaṃdhu* could be taken as the form in the context, and that the metre might be *makaradhvajahāsa* (*same ekādaśa oje dvādaśa makaradhvajahāsaḥ,* Ibid. p. 205).

I had to write to him again as I felt some difficulty in adopting the form *vīsaraagaṃdhu,* because except in the case of some specific forms (śrī etc., Cf. Trivi. 1-4-99, and others), the "r" occurring as the final of the conjunct consonants is elided in the Prakrit forms as is recorded in *ro lukam adhaḥ* (Trivi. 3-3-5), and therefore it did not seem possible to retain the "r" of the *visra* of Sanskrit in the Prakrit forms. I also asked for his opinion as to whether there was anything wrong in taking the verse to be in the metre of *pañcānanalalitā,* as its definition seemed to be applicable here too.

In his second letter of the 12th December, 1967, Professor Upādhye informed me that if the *mātrās*

9. I am indebted to Professor Upādhye for this information also. In Sanskrit however *visraka* is rarely found. *Śārṅgadharasaṃhitā* (3-12-9) has the following:
pittaṃ pītena haritaṃ nīlaṃ śyāvañ ca visrakam. In the *chāyā* of the verse in this context no manuscript gives *visraka.*

agreed any name could be suggested for the metre of the verse, and that that way the Apabhraṃśa[10] left "a broad margin" for different opinions. He also stated that retention of "r" after *svarabhakti* was not impossible in the Apabhraṃśa. Finally he however conveyed his opinion that if the reading *vīsaa-* be found that was quite welcome.

Here I should mention that the transcript of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS Library reads in this place as *visagaṃdhua,* whereas the Trivandrum transcript gives as *visaaṃgaṃdhasu.* The Grantha manuscript (Adyar) seems to be corrupt. I therefore felt like depending upon the Telugu manuscript, and taking the expression as *vīsaagaṃdhu,*[11] and after some corrections about which I have discussed in the notes, I chose the reading of the relevant portion as given before on page 52.

From the comments of Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha in this context it appears that in this verse a particular lady was praising other ladies for their sweet smell which was lasting long and was agreeable to the cosmetics they used, and that at the same time she was deploring her own self because of the fact that whatever be her make-up, with her it was (always) the smelling of a raw meat (*visragandha*) caused by the wounds on the body of her husband (who being a valorous warrior

10. Different opinions are not uncommon in Sanskrit too. An instance of an *aupacchandasika* coming under *mātrāchandas* in the *Vṛttaratnākara* is given the name of *mālabhāriṇī* and treated under *ardhasamavṛttas* by Hemacandra.

11. By applying the *svārthe kaḥ* we can get the form *vīsaa* in the Prakrit, although the Sanskrit here does not have *visraka* where all the manuscripts read only *visra*.

used to sustain them in the course of his (various battles). This is only a seeming praise for the other ladies; and the intended implication is that she was really fortunate in having for her a husband who was an illustrious warrior, and it was the other ladies who were not fortunate because of the fact that their husbands were cowards and consequently never stayed in the battle-field for any time, as it should be evident from the absence of any such wounds on their bodies.

Here in spite of the fact that one is the *aṅgin* (*śṛṅgāra*) and the other the *aṅgarasa*, the two *rasas* *bībhatsa* and *śṛṅgāra* are opposed to each other, and although the *ālambanavibhāva* is the same person (her husband, the courageous hero), yet it is possible to have the *two* because of the intervening *vīrarasa*, as there is no *bādhyabādhakabhāva*[12] between *śṛṅgāra* and *vīra* and between *vīra* and *bībhatsa*.[13] Therefore the aesthetic experience in this case is not adversely affected.

The intervening *rasa* in this instance seems to be *vīrarasa* because of the cemments *svabhartuḥ śaurya-prakaṭanena tatpriyatamānām aśauryaṃ kācid brūte* by Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha, and need not be the *hāsyarasa* as was once tentatively surmised. This seems to be corroborated by a reading of the relevant sentence of the

12. It is possible for a person to love his wife and at the same time to be an illustrious warrior. Similarly, in spite of some wounds on the body of her husband the wife can still love him, or more so for these very wounds which may make her feel proud, because these are symbols of his valour in fighting courageously in the battles.

13. The *viruddharasas* are mentioned thus:
Śṛṅgārabībhatsarasau tathā vīrabhayānakau,
raudrādbhutau tathā hāsyakaruṇau vairiṇau mithaḥ |
(*Śṛṅgāratilaka*).

Avaloka in a manuscript[14] (Telugu) of the Adyar Library, running as:

> *ity atra bībhatsasya vīrarasavyavadhānena śṛṅgāre samāveśo na viruddhaḥ*
>
> (page 50, MS. 68287).

This sentence coming as a comment by Dhanika on the Prakrit verse is found in the place of the one available in print, which was quoted earlier on page 53.

From these available data it should be possible for us to set aside all unnecessary conjectures regarding this once-difficult illustrative verse. I feel that the portion of the *Laghuṭīkā* of Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha given above on page 52-53 may be taken as representing a genuine source and affording a correct interpretation. Personally, after several years of hard struggle in the matter, I feel very happy for the solution to the mysteries of this verse, which has been made possible by the learned comments of the great Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha.

14. This manuscript however gives a different reading of the Apabhraṃśa verse and without *chāyā*, the merits of which I do not propose to discuss here.

Appendix II

CORRECTED TEXT OF THE PORTION OF THE *AVALOKA*

on verse IV-34 of the *Daśarūpaka*

with

Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's Commentary, the *Laghuṭīkā*

Appendix II

CORRECTED TEXT OF THE PORTION OF THE *AVALOKA*

on verse IV-34 of the *Daśarūpaka*

with

Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's Commentary, the *Laghuṭīkā*

As the Apabhraṃśa verse discussed in my paper (given as Appendix I) forms the final part of the continuous topic dealt with in the preceding lines of the *Avaloka,* and as this portion of the *Avaloka* too as available in print has many mistakes, I thought of giving here the relevant portion of Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's commentary, and the related text of the *Avaloka* based on a Telugu manuscript of the Adyar Library, Madras, with some corrections which in my opinion were needed. It is my sincere hope that the portion of the commentary and the text given here will facilitate a better understanding of the topic.

I am delighted to express my hearty thanks and acknowledgement to the authorities of the Adyar Library, of the Govt. Oriental MSS Library, Madras, and of the Trivandrum MSS Library, now of the University of Kerala, for their kindness in supplying me with the following material:

(1) Microfilm copy of the Palm-leaf Telugu Ms of *Avaloka* and DR, with the number 68287; Adyar Library;

(2) Microfilm copy of Palm-leaf Telugu Ms of Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's Comm. (75365) Adyar Library;

(3) Microfilm copy of Palm-leaf Grantha Ms. of Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's Comm. (70066) Adyar Library;

(4) Transcript of last item (70066) Adyar Library;

(5) Transcript of Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's Comm. R 2421, Madras Govt. Oriental MSS Library;

(6) Transcript of Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha's Comm. 1974-B; Oriental MSS Library, Trivandrum.

As I hope to discuss at a later stage different readings and allied matters of the manuscripts of the commentary, I do not propose to discuss them now. After a careful collation of the different copies at my disposal I have selected and given the readings in this portion, which I thought to be suitable and necessary on the basis of the evidence available.

(घनिकस्य दशरूपावलोक :— ४-३४)

अथ स्थायी :—

विरुद्धैरविरुद्धैर्वा भावैर्विच्छिद्यते न यः ।
आत्मभावं नयत्यन्यान् स स्थायी लवणाकरः ॥ ४-३४

सजातीयविजातीयभावान्तरैरतिरस्कृतत्वेनोपनिबध्यमानो रत्यादिः स्थायी । यथा बृहत्कथायां नरवाहनदत्तस्य [1]मदनमञ्जर्यामनुरागः तत्तदवान्तरनायिकानुरागैरतिरस्कृतः स्थायी । यथा च मालतीमाधवे श्मशानाङ्के बीभत्सेन मालत्यनुरागस्य अतिरस्कारो “मम हि प्राक्तनोपलम्भसम्भावि-

1. Printed text (N.S.P. edn. 1941) reads Madana-mañjūṣāyām.

तात्मजन्मनः संस्कारस्यानवरतप्रबोधात् प्रतायमानस्तद्विसदृशैः प्रत्ययान्तरै-रतिरस्कृतप्रवाहः प्रियतमाप्रत्ययोत्पत्तिसन्तानस्तन्मयमिव करोति [2]वृत्तिसारू-प्यतश्चैतन्यम्" इत्यादिनोपनिबद्धः । तदनेन प्रकारेण विरोधिनामविरोधि-नाञ्च समावेशो न विरोधी ।

2. Printed text has *"antarvṛtti-"*.

(भट्टनृसिंहस्य लघुटीका)

विरुद्धैरविरुद्धैर्वेति । अस्यार्थः=विरुद्धैरविरुद्धैर्वा भावैर्य आहित: संस्कारो न विच्छेदी भवति, प्रत्युत तान् सर्वान् आत्मभावं नयति, स स्थायी भावो लवणाकरः । लवणाकरवल्लवणाकरः । उक्तं हि :—

"यथा रुमायां लवणाकरेषु मेरौ यथा वोज्जवलरुक्मभूमौ
यज्जायते तन्मयमेव तत् स्यात्" इति ।

(तन्त्रवार्तिकम्-आनन्दाश्रम-पुटे २०७)

विरुद्धाविरुद्धाविच्छेदित्वमन्यद् अनुत्पाद्येतिवृत्तेषु अन्यद् उत्पाद्ये-तिवृत्तेषु च प्रबन्धेषु [1]दृष्टमित्याह-**यथेत्यादिना ।**

1. Adyar Grantha Ms reads *viruddhāvicchedatvam anyat utpādyetivrateṣu utpādyetivṛtteṣu pṛṣṭam ityāha*. The Telugu Ms (Adyar) and Madras Govt. transcript give as *viruddhāviruddhāviccheditvam anutpādyetivṛtteṣu*. On I-15 of the DR Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha explains before that *prakhyāta* is of two types *itihāsakathātaḥ prasiddham, lokakathātaḥ prasiddham*. And about *utpādya* he says *yatra itivṛttaṃ kavibuddhyaiva kalpyate tad utpādyam*. From this it appears that any *itivṛtta* based on *bṛhatkathā* (i.e. *lokakathā*) is treated by him as *lokakathātaḥ prakhyātam* (i.e. *anutpādya*) and the story of *Mālatīmādhava* will be *utpādyam*. As both are cited in the *Avaloka* for illustration, I think that the sentence intended here must have reference to both. Therefore I gave it as *anyad anutpādyetivṛtteṣu anyad utpādyetivṛtteṣu ca prabadndheṣu dṛṣṭam ityāha*.

(अवलोकः)

तथाहि । कथं विरोधः ? सहानवस्थानम् , बाध्यबाधकभावो वा ?[2] उभयरूपो[3] न तावत्। स्वादात्मनि[4] तस्य एकरूपत्वेनाविर्भावात् । स्थायिनां विभावादीनां[5] च यदि विरोधः, तत्रापि न तावत् सहानवस्थानम् । रत्याद्युपरक्ते चेतसि स्रक्सूत्रन्यायेन अविरोधिनां व्यभिचारिणां विरोधिनां चोपनिबन्धः समस्तभावकस्वसंवेदनसिद्धः ! यथैव च स्वसंवेदनसिद्धस्तथैव काव्यव्यापारसंरम्भेण अनुकार्येऽप्यावेश्यमानः स्वचेतस्संभेदेन[6] तथाविधानन्दसंविदुन्मीलनहेतुः सम्पद्यते ।

तस्मान्न तावद् भावानां सहानवस्थानम् । बाध्यबाधकभावो[7] हि भावान्तरैर्भावान्तरतिरस्कारः । स च व्यभिचारिणां स्थायिना न विरोधः[8] (सम्भवति) । व्यभिचारिभिः (च) स्थायिनो न विरुद्धाः[9]। तेषामङ्गत्वात् ।

3. N.S.P. edition gives *ubhayarūpeṇāpi.*

4. This is a better reading than *tādātmyasya eka-* etc. given in print.

5. It is not clear why it is *vibhāvādīnām.* As he is discussing the *virodha* between *sthāyibhāva* and *vyabhicāribhāva, bhāvādīnām* perhaps would be suitable. I do not know whether *vyabhicārins* are also referred to as *vibhāvas* in any text.

6. Adyar Ms (Telugu) reads *svasaṃvedanena.* But I have given the reading according to the *pratīka* cited by Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha.

7. Printed text has *bādhyabādhakabhāvas tu,* but what is given above is the *pratīka* in the commentary.

8. Adyar Ms reads *viruddhaḥ* and without *saṃbhavati.* The reading given above is based on the interpretation and wording of Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha.

9. The MS reads *viddhāḥ* which is obviously a mistake of the scribe.

प्रधानविरुद्धस्य चाङ्गत्वायोगात्। आनन्तर्यविरोधोऽपि[10] अनेनैव[11] प्रकारेणापास्तः (सन्) न सम्भवति[12]। तथा च मालतीमाधवे शृङ्गारानन्तरं बीभत्सोपनिबन्धेऽपि न किञ्चिद् वैरस्यम्।

तदेवमवस्थिते[13] विरुद्धरसैकालम्बनत्वमेव विरोधहेतुः[14]। स तु अविरुद्धरसान्तरव्यवधानेनोपनिबध्यमानो न विरोधी। यथा :-

10. MS reads *-virodhitvam api*. Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha gives the above reading.

11. MS reads *anena prakāreṇa*. Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha gives *anenaiva prakāreṇa*.

12. Printed text and MS have *apāstaṃ bhavati*.

13. Perhaps the reading was *avasthito*. Or else we may supply *sthāyinaḥ sthāyyantareṇa virodha ity asmin viṣaye* to be construed with the locative *avasthite*.

14. Printed text has *virodhe hetuḥ*.

(लघुटीका)

अविच्छेदं प्रतिज्ञातमुपपादयति **तथाहीत्यादिना**। कथमिति[1-a]। अत्र स्थायिनः स्थाय्यन्तरेण विरोधस्तावत् तिष्ठतु। किं तु स्थायिनः परिपोषकतया निधीयमाना विभावादय एव यदि तं विरुन्ध्युस्तर्हि का गतिरिति चेत् तत्राह—**स्थायिनां विभावादीनाञ्च यदि विरोध इति**। हेतुमाह—**रत्याद्युपरक्ते इति**। यदा हि रत्याद्युपरक्तं भवति मनस्तदा तद्विरोधिनां जुगुप्सादीनाम् अविरोधिनामुत्कण्ठादीनां तेन रत्यादिना

1a. From the commentary it appears that there was perhaps the reading of *katham* before *virodhaḥ* in the *Avaloka*.

सहभावो दृष्टः। यथाशुक्ल[2]कृष्णपुष्पसम्भेदेऽपि अनुस्यूतस्य स्रक्सूत्रस्येत्यर्थः। न केवलं दर्शनमेव। तथैवोपनिबन्धोऽपीत्याह-**यथैवेति**। **स्वचेतस्सम्भेदेनेति**। वक्ष्यति हि रसाविर्भावप्रकारमुपपादयन्

"स्वादः काव्यार्थसम्भेदादात्मानन्दसमुद्भवः" इति। (४–४३)

एवंप रिहृतं सहानवस्थानमुपसंहरति—**तस्मादिति**। बाध्यबाधकभावलक्षणस्य विरोधस्याप्यभावं वर्णयन् तत्स्वरूपं तावदाह—**बाध्यबाधकभावो हीति**। स हि रत्याद्याहितसंस्कारस्य भावान्तरैर्विच्छेदः। स्वरूपस्य पुनरुत्तरकालीनेन प्रत्ययान्तरेणैव विच्छेदादिति। एवं स्वरूपं परिशोध्य[3]—द्वावेव पक्षौ सम्भवतः; व्यभिचारिभावांस्ते विरुन्धताम्, व्यभिचारिणो वा विरुन्ध्युरिति। तत्र तेषां व्यभिचारिभिर्विरोधो न सम्भवति। स्थायित्वात्। व्यभिचारिणाञ्च अस्थायित्वात्। स्थायित्वञ्च विषयरामणीयकेन तेषां सम्भवति। व्यभिचारिणाञ्च अस्थायित्वं स्वरूपमेव "स्थायिन्युन्मग्ननिर्मग्ना" इति वचनात् (दशरूपकम्—४-७)। स्थायिविरुद्धानामपि व्यभिचारित्वं न सम्भवति। तान् प्रति तेषामङ्गत्वात्। प्रधानानुकूलं खल्वङ्गं भवति। न तु तद्विरुद्धम्—[3]इत्याह **स चेति**। ननु माभूद् यौगपद्येन विरोधः। स्थायिभावानन्तरमेव विजातीयानां निबन्धः एकवाक्ये विरुद्ध इत्यस्माभिरुच्यत इति चेत् तत्राह — **आनन्तर्यविरोधोऽपीति**। **अनेनैव प्रकारेण** = प्रधानविरुद्धस्याङ्गत्वं न सम्भवतीति प्रकारेण। तदेवं स्वाङ्गभूतैर्भावैः स्थायिभावानां न कश्चिद् विरोध इत्युक्तम्। स्थायिनः स्थाय्यन्तरेण विरोध इति तु परिशिष्यते। तत्राह—

2. Kṛṣṇa is a synonym of *nīla* in Sanskrit. So here it must mean some blue flowers like *nīlotpala*.

3. *pariśodhya* is connected with *ity āha* coming before *sa ceti*.

तदेवमिति । स्थायिनो रसस्य अङ्गभूतैरपि रसान्तैरेकाश्रयत्वं[4] परिहरणीयमित्यर्थः । किं तत् सर्वथा त्यजनीयमेव तेषाम् एकाश्रयत्वम् ? नेत्याह **—स त्विति ।**

After this, comes the portion

vyavadhānena avirodham udāharati, etc.

which was given earlier on page 52.

4. The *Avaloka*: *viruddharasaikālambanatvam eva virodhahetuḥ* is being explained in this sentence. Bhaṭṭanṛsiṃha by his comment using *ekāśrayatvam* seems to take the two expressions *ekālambanatvam* and *ekāśrayatvam* to convey the same idea, and not in the restricted senses involving a difference between *ālambana* and *āśraya* as noted by later writers like Viśvanātha and others.

ERRATA

Page		*Read*
10.	line 23	*-bījārtha-*
19.	verse 4, second line,	*prājñair*
22.	Footnote, first line (for than)	then
22.	„ third line (for that)	*tat*
24.	verse 24, first line	*vīthyaṅgaiḥ*
30.	verse 54, „ „	*jñāpyaṃ*
32.	verse 61, „ „	*aṅkāntapātrair*
50.	Footnote, line 8	point
52.	line 17	*udāharati*
58.	lines 1-2	(various) battles